

Council member _____ introduced the following resolution and moved for its adoption:

RESOLUTION NO. 26-__

**A RESOLUTION VACATING A PORTION OF A MUNICIPAL STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY
WITHIN THE PLAT OF GRAND RAPIDS SECOND DIVISION**

WHEREAS, the City Planning Commission, at a regular meeting on May 7, 2026, reviewed the vacation request for a public easement right-of-way, described as:

That portion of the perpetual easement for street, alley and utility purposes established under Document No. 402815 recorded in the Office of the Itasca County, Minnesota Recorder, described as follows:

That part of vacated 12th Street (13th Street as shown in the Plat of Crowder Addition) lying between the southerly extension of the east line of the vacated N/S alley in Block 7 and the southerly extension of the center line of vacated 3rd Avenue SE; AND

The west half of vacated 3rd Avenue SE lying adjacent to Lots 4-6, Block 7, Crowder Addition to Grand Rapids, Itasca County, MN.

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission found the vacation to be in the best interest of public health, safety, and general welfare; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission forwarded a recommendation for approval of the requested vacation; and

WHEREAS, the City Clerk's affidavit of publication of Notice of Public Hearing and of mailing notices to area residents were provided; and

WHEREAS, the Grand Rapids City Council conducted a public hearing on EDIT May 11, 2026, to consider the vacation of the public right-of-way described above; and

WHEREAS, all persons who wished to voice their opinion in regard to the above-mentioned

vacation were allowed to be heard; and

WHEREAS, it appears that it will be in the best interest of the City to approve such petition.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF GRAND RAPIDS, MINNESOTA: that the City Council does concur with the Planning Commission's findings that the vacation is in the best interest of the public's health, safety, and general welfare, and hereby vacate the above-described public right-of-way based on the following findings of fact:

- The rights-of-way is not needed for traffic purposes.
- The right-of-way is not needed for pedestrian purposes.
- The right-of-way is not needed for utility purposes.
- Vacating the right-of-way will is a step leading to placing additional land on the tax rolls.
- Vacating the right-of-way will help establish clear title for future sale and redevelopment of the property.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that:

1. The City Council directs City Staff to submit a copy of this resolution to the Itasca County Assessor, Itasca County Auditor, and Itasca County Recorder.

Adopted by the Council this 11th day of May 2026.

Tasha Connelly, Mayor

ATTEST:

Kim Gibeau, City Clerk

Council member _____ seconded the foregoing resolution, and the following voted in favor thereof: _____ ; and the following voted against same: _____ ; whereby the resolution was declared duly passed and adopted.